

DEAR FOLKS:

WHEN you work hard and conscientiously to achieve a result and you feel down deep that you have succeeded—don't you like it very, VERY much when somebody comes along that you know is an expert and he tells you that your work is splendid and he congratulates you?

Is it not just human for all of us to like to hear praise of our work?

Well, I saw a very happy group of workers assembled in the CANNED GOODS DEPARTMENT of the Wilson & Co. plant, Chicago, on Friday, March 14th.

I call your attention to the fact that Friday with its SIX LETTERS carries with it as much luck as far as the Wilson & Co. organization is concerned. It is the Cycle of Six, which is such a dominant factor in the business and brings so much happiness and success.

In the group of workers was Thomas E. Wilson, President of Wilson & Co., who is as intense and as enthusiastic as any of the 25,000 workers in his organization. There were also in the group three Vice-presidents of the company. I mention this to prove what I have been telling you, that the Wilson & Co. organization represents DEMOCRACY OF WORK, which starts with the head and goes all through the ranks. One man is as good as another in this organization; one woman is as good as another; and both men and women are on a basis of equality in the matter of recognition and reward for service well rendered.

Now I will tell you why they were so happy:

ALFRED W. MCCANN, THE FAMOUS PURE FOOD EXPERT, HAD JUST FINISHED TASTING AND TESTING THE WILSON & CO. CERTIFIED BRANDS OF CANNED MEATS, VEGETABLES AND FRUITS, AND THEN SAID:

"I TAKE OFF MY HAT TO THESE PURE FOOD PRODUCTS. YOU HAVE PRODUCED A VERY FINE AND A VERY WONDERFUL LINE, AND I CONGRATULATE YOU."

Wouldn't it make you happy if you, like the Wilson & Co. workers, had been working hard to perfect food products and felt sure that you had succeeded, to have Mr. McCann—a man who knows what pure food is—tell you that you had achieved a wonderful result?

You bet it would.

Well, the Wilson & Co. workers are the same kind of human beings as you are—so they were made very happy when Mr. McCann, who had selected at random from the immense stocks of canned goods—cans of Corn, Peas, Beans, Asparagus, Meats, Preserves, etc.—and had then opened up and then tasted and then endorsed them.

I know Mr. McCann personally and intimately. He is an honest, fearless, able man. Nobody on earth has ever yet been able to control his opinions or his pen. Both are owned by himself and by nobody else.

I know he meant what he said when he told those workers that their Certified foods are O. K. in all particulars, and I know also that if he had not thought they were O. K. in all particulars, the tender of a million dollars cash on the spot would not have made him endorse them.

Mr. McCann could have been rich by now had he wished to barter his honor—but he has kept himself clean and straight—AND POOR, as most men do who are content and intense in doing things to help and protect humanity.

I did not know that Mr. McCann was in Chicago until he walked into the Wilson & Co. restaurant, which, by the way, is a big, democratic affair where officials and workers dine together in the same way that members of a family meet at their own dining room table.

He told me he had come to Chicago to investigate the Wilson & Co. business because his interest had been aroused by reading these letters that I am writing to you. At the end of the day he was good enough to say that he found everything exactly as I have said there in Heart, Honor, and the Square Deal all throughout the Wilson & Co. organization.

Mr. McCann and I once spoke from the same platform at Sagamore Beach, Mass., where intense people gather and discuss the big problems of the day. I will never forget the great ovation Mr. McCann received on that occasion. He is a very dramatic and very intense speaker. He had carefully prepared a speech, but after its delivery the large audience insisted on his continuing to talk. THEY WANTED TO HEAR MORE ABOUT HIS CRUSADE AGAINST IMPURE FOODS.

He talked for an hour longer, and then the audience consented to his stopping only because it was time for lunch, but even then they exacted a promise from him to resume at the afternoon session. He did speak again at the afternoon session and held his hearers spellbound for hours.

HIS WORK HAS ALWAYS BEEN VERY STRENUOUS AND HONEST. HE HAS CONTRASTED TREMENDOUSLY TO THE HIGH STANDARDS THAT NOW PREVAIL IN THE MANUFACTURE OF PURE FOODS.

When he returned from Chicago he wrote some wonderful articles about his visit to the Wilson & Co. plant, which were printed in the New York Evening Globe. He knows, and so do I, and I think you are beginning to know, that the slogan used by Wilson & Co.—"THE WILSON LABEL PROTECTS YOUR TABLE"—means what it says.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM C. FREEMAN,
250 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Whitman Called Shonts Agent By Thompson

Continued from page 1

tion, asked him to tell about "the other interview."

"Well, that interview was all right, except in my mind," replied Senator Thompson. "The proceeding and interview with Burke kind of brought to me from both ways—it didn't look as though it were fair unless it was brought against me on my attitude. That was all. That, taken alone, was nothing in itself. It was all right. It wasn't an improper thing if taken alone, not at all. So, under these circumstances, whether it ought to be given I don't know."

"I think we should have it," said Chairman Alvah H. Burlingame.

Thompson: You know about it, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Cheney knows about it, and I have told him. Now, if you think I ought to state it, why, all right.

The Chairman: Yes, I think we should have it.

Mr. Cheney: The committee wants it. I think you should give it, Mr. Thompson.

Thompson: It was Mr. Whitman. The Chairman: First name, please.

Thompson: Charles S.

Mr. Cheney: And you saw him where?

Met in the St. Regis

Thompson: St. Regis Hotel.

Mr. Cheney: State the conversation then, Mr. Thompson.

Thompson: Give it all?

Burlingame: Yes, let's have it.

Thompson: He (Whitman) is an awfully good visitor, and we went into the St. Regis and had lunch. There was a good deal of conversation. I didn't know what he wanted to see me for, and at first he suggested I should come to New York and I should leave. He said I could have \$50,000 a year, and, of course, that is more than I made in Middleport, and I talked about it. I went far enough in the conversation to find out he didn't want me for a partner.

Senator Foley: Did you try to find out how to make the fifty thousand a year?

Thompson: Of course, \$50,000 was more than I had ever thought of. I had thought of \$25,000, but I thought I could live better in Middleport on \$5,000 or \$6,000 than in New York.

Then the talk was shifted to politics, state politics, and the talk suggested the next candidate for Governor. I was told in that conversation now, I don't want to repeat it, but he said I was the only figure up the state that could be nominated for Governor.

And he said that he had the reputation of being a good man, but he said I should be in a position to be the candidate at all didn't want it. And after that he told me that the reason he wanted to see me was because Mr. Shonts asked him to talk to me in relation to this Carson-Martin bill and wanted me to vote for it.

I told him I didn't believe he understood the Carson-Martin bill and I said, "Governor, that bill provides for the reorganization of a contract, and I cannot understand any circumstances support it. I have said so, publicly and privately and in every way," and I said, "I am worn out by the arguments on it, and I cannot support it."

Not Fair to the Public

And I said I had gone down to New York and investigated it and that the deal was a contract that was a large part of the subject of the investigation. I didn't think it was a fair contract to the City of New York, anyway, and that I had called on several reputable people in New York whose testimony was taken and asked them what the city of New York got by virtue of that deal.

And I said, "The guarantee of a universal five-cent fare for fifty years," and that was the consideration the people of the City of New York gave for that contract.

Now they want to put through a bill that defeats that conception and still gives the company everything else that that contract gives them, a great deal of which I don't think they should have or deserve now. And I said, "I wouldn't be for this bill. I feel the bill ought to be beaten, and I shall do everything I can to oppose it, and I would be ashamed ever to come to New York if I did anything to pass that bill."

Whitman Suggests Changes

"Well," said Governor Whitman, "if you feel like that, don't you think it could be changed?" and I said: "I don't know whether it could be changed or not. I hadn't thought of it. Earlier in the year I was willing to have the investigation of the situation, but it is too late now. There isn't any question about that," I said. "I cannot stand for it, and I don't know how they could be revised. I haven't a copy of the bill here. I don't remember the exact language. If it could be changed to give power to the City of New York to revise on contract I don't mind."

He said: "Supposing you see if you can't fix it up some way. When are you going back?" and I said: "Monday."

He said: "I would like to see you tomorrow or Monday." I said: "If I had a copy of the bill I would look at it. I don't think anything can be done."

He didn't know where he could get a copy of the bill, and I said: "Probably the Interborough have some copies down there," and I said, "If you can send me the bill I will look it over."

He said he would get one and send it to me and wanted to know where I was and I said: "Down at the club." So that night he sent a copy of the bill in an envelope, and I saw that there was no worded that it was either that or nothing; that is all.

Asks About Bill

Q: Is there anything further you can say in regard to it?

A: There is a whole lot of things. The following Monday I called on Governor Whitman and told him I couldn't change the bill any. I didn't see any could be done. He hoped something could be done. He talked about the politics in this situation in reference to the bill on Saturday. He thought it would be bad politics to oppose it, and he told me that I will tell you why if you want it.

Senator Knight: Might I ask if this was in the public dining room?

A: Yes.

Depends on Man Behind

Burlingame: Had that anything to do in your mind with this charge?

A: Well, figure it out to suit yourself. My mind operates on it that it depends on the men that sent both of these men.

Q: Did Burke have anything to do with the Whitman episode?

A: I don't know. I don't know who sent him or anything else. If the

The "Bribe" Inquiry Opens at Albany

FOUR CENTRAL FIGURES IN THE BRIBE HEARING



EX-GOVERNOR WHITMAN



RICHARD H. BURKE



SENATOR G. F. THOMPSON



THEODORE P. SHONTS

same man sent Burke as Whitman, the whole thing wasn't right.

Senator MacCrack: Did Mr. Whitman indicate to you, Senator, that he was representing any one or any interest?

Asserts Shonts Asked Whitman to Come

A. Yes, he said he had been asked to come to me by Mr. Shonts, but he said he was not retained.

Senator Black: Did you connect up Governor Whitman's statement concerning your gubernatorial chances with your attitude on this bill?

A. Why, I think the statement was perhaps made for the purpose of changing my attitude on the bill, yes. But because it is silly—I haven't any chance to be Governor of the state—it is all nonsense. It is so silly, I don't think he thinks or thought that I had the slightest chance to be Governor of the state.

Whitman Not "Retained"

Senator Foley: Was there anything said about him representing the gas company or electric light company, or his firm representing them?

A. No. I told you what he said. He said Mr. Shonts had sent him to see me to see if he could persuade me to vote for this bill. He said he wasn't retained. I don't know what you mean by that in New York.

Senator Foley: It may mean you haven't been paid a retainer or haven't been actually engaged.

A. Well, whatever it was, that is what he said.

Seeks to Clarify Testimony on Offer

Senator Brown—Mr. Chairman: With your permission, Senator, I want to make this perfectly clear on the record that of your statements in connection with the matter I have gained the impression that some person or persons had approached you with an offer of money in return for your vote and influence in support of the Carson bill. After hearing your testimony here I got the impression that you mean that these persons had offered to contribute to a campaign for the Governorship, and that there was no direct offer of money to go into your pocket.

A. Unless an offer to contribute to the campaign fund in a campaign you don't intend to enter into was an indirect offer. Of course there wasn't any if that was an indirect offer I don't believe I have a right to accept a contribution for a campaign fund now.

Senator Brown: Was there any offer of money to you except as the money was to be put into a campaign fund when a campaign should come on?

A. I got the conversation that the campaign fund was to be guaranteed right away and paid over.

Q. And paid over?

Q. Where Was No Dicker

Q. Where was no dicker amounts or just one amount? Did the amount increase from time to time?

A. Oh, no. Of course it was perfectly well known that it costs a great deal to run for Governor of New York, I suppose.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Thompson Says Burke Offered Him \$500,000 Fund for the Governorship

Thompson said, after consulting a small notebook which he carried in his vest pocket, that Burke finally met him on February 6 at the Grand Central station as he stepped from an Albany train. He said that Burke asked him to go down town, to see a lawyer, at which meeting traction legislation was discussed. Burke, he said, told the lawyer that Thompson believed the New York City traction situation should be investigated, and that nothing could be accomplished in the way of remedial legislation until the public had been informed of the facts and enabled to judge of the justice of the demand of the street railroads for an increased fare. He said the lawyer replied that he thought the companies could make out a good case and that he would put the question of investigation up to the Interborough.

Thompson was reluctant to give the lawyer's name, saying that nothing improper had transpired, but on request of Chairman Burlingame, Thompson said the lawyer was John B. Stanchfield.

Thompson said that on February 14, when he was in his room at the Republic Hotel in New York City, Burke telephoned him and asked him if he could see Stanchfield again. Thompson said Burke made a call at his room and that they went down together.

Too Late for Inquiry

He said that Mr. Stanchfield told him that he had consulted James M. Quackenbush, counsel for the Interborough, and that Mr. Quackenbush had said that it was too late now for an investigation. Thompson said that he proposed to the legislative leaders here, following this talk, that he ought to be an investigation of the New York City traction situation, but that his proposal fell on unresponsive ears. Thompson said he saw Stanchfield again and an appointment was made for him with Mr. Quackenbush, which he was unable to keep.

"I next saw Burke at the Republican Club on February 28," continued Thompson.

"I told him that I couldn't get any facts or figures, only conclusions. He said 'Come with me and I'll take you to a man whom you can depend on; he will fix you up.' As a result I met Mr. Brady at his home, 859 Fifth Avenue. I had always said that he was connected with the Brooklyn Rapid Transit, and Brady told me that the railroads were operating under very hard conditions and that he thought they were entitled to some relief."

Asked for Statement: Got Unsatisfactory One

Senator Thompson then came down to influence him improperly. He said Burke called on him the following Sunday morning at the Republican Club. When Burke saw me the first thing he said was, 'Now, George, I have got an important thing that I want to tell you, and he said: 'I want you to do this now. You can stand for this bill, and he said: 'If you do, that will be the biggest thing that ever happened to you. You just stand for this bill and I will make you Governor. These people will be behind you.' He named

Bill Would Let State Raise Fares

THE amendment to the Public Service Commissions law, in behalf of which State Senator George F. Thompson has charged bribery, would enable the Public Service Commissions to revise common carrier rates, "notwithstanding a different rate, fare or charge prescribed by any consent, franchise or contract of the local authorities of any city or other political subdivision of the state."

In its unratified form the law gives the Public Service Commissions power to revise rates when it is determined that they are "unjust, unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory or unduly preferential, or in any way in violation of any provision of law, or that the maximum rates . . . are insufficient to yield reasonable compensation for the service rendered and are unjust and unreasonable."

Under the existing law, however, it was not stated that the commissions had the power to overrule the terms of franchise, but merely that, being satisfied by public hearing of the injustice of the present rates, they could change them, "notwithstanding that a higher rate, fare or charge, has been heretofore authorized by statute."

pretty good judge of human nature from what can gather. Now that is all the conversation of any kind or character that took place about the government in my presence that I can recall, and that is as true as that you are standing on this floor."

Says He Sought Contracts

Was anything said at that conversation in the Senator's room in March 16 about these traction bills then pending in the Legislature?

A. There certainly was.

Q. What was it?

A. Why, Thompson said he wanted to help, and I was very anxious to see it through. I thought I could break in some money myself.

Chairman Burlingame: Mr. Burke, what did you mean when you said you thought you could "break in yourself"?

A. Why, I am not a legislative agent. I never advanced anything in the way of legislation in my life. I am looking for a living for my four children and myself. I thought that if I was in any way connected with the traction bills, I might be able to get something out of it. I am looking for a living for my four children and myself. I thought that if I was in any way connected with the traction bills, I might be able to get something out of it.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

Q. Was the first a small amount mentioned, and then later a larger amount was mentioned?

A. No. We didn't get into any dicker, if that is what you are getting at. There was no dicker over the amount at all.

at his office at 129 Broadway yesterday. His secretary said Mr. Stanchfield was suffering from influenza and has not been at the office for two weeks. He had a relapse this morning, it was said, and had left word that he was not to be disturbed.

At the office of Nicholas F. Brady it was said that Mr. Brady was out of town for the week-end, but would be back Monday.

Central Union Asks Senate To Prohibit Seven-Cent Fare

The Central Federated Union adopted resolutions last night protesting the passage of any bill that would make a seven-cent fare possible in New York. It was asserted in the resolution that the financial difficulties of the traction companies were due to their prolonged fight against organized labor and that they now sought to make the public pay the expenses of that fight.

The Governor, the Lieutenant Governor and members of the State Senate were called upon to defeat any legislation which would make that possible. The resolutions were introduced by William J. Coyne, of the Federal Employees' Union.

Garrison Tells Hylan He Will Not Meet Union

Continued from page 1

you as composing the committee, is an employee of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit system, and it is therefore out of the question for me to see and confer with them about their conditions or to the end that their conditions of employment may be improved. I presume that they are acting on behalf of the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America.

"The Brooklyn Rapid Transit system has about 13,000 employees. I am always willing to meet with them at any time with committees selected by these employees and representative of them."

Amalgamated Blamed

"I am not willing to and will not deal with or meet committees selected not by the body of the employees, but only by such as are members of the Amalgamated. In this question the great body of our employees is not concerned. They have appointed no committees, presented no demands and have not, in fact, participated in them. The minority, which does not represent even one-half of the employees, is attempting to create differences with the management of the system and to force the management to deal with this outside organization."

"In your letter you refer to an amicable settlement of the differences between the employees and the Brooklyn Rapid Transit. There is no difficulty of which I have any knowledge, excepting such as arises out of the attempt by the Amalgamated Association to secure recognition."

"The propriety of the position of the management in refusing to permit itself to be forced to do this is too clear to require elaboration."